

Applicant amends claim 8 to solely to correct the inadvertent omission of the term "second."

With respect to claim 1, this claim is directed to a combination of elements including a first satellite antenna for generating a wide beam communication signal to illuminate a plurality of satellites, means for generating a return communication signal from each of the plurality of satellites, a second satellite antenna for receiving the return communication signal from only one of the plurality of satellites, and a satellite antenna repositioning system for repositioning said second antenna when the sun transits within a beamwidth of said second antenna. The Examiner asserts that Mallinckrodt, in view of Bond, teaches all of these claimed elements. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, the Examiner's explanation of how Mallinckrodt teaches a number of the claimed elements misstates portions of the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner states that Mallinckrodt teaches "a first satellite antenna 22 for receiving the return communication signal from one of the plurality of satellites." The claimed invention, however, recites, among other things, "a first satellite antenna for generating a wide beam communication signal to illuminate a plurality of satellites." The Examiner goes on to state that the antenna 22 "transmits wide beam signals to both satellites (62) and receive from one of the satellites 62." For an antenna to generate a wide beam signal but to only receive signals from one of the satellites is illogical. Therefore, Mallinckrodt, neither as applied by the Examiner, nor in fact, fails to teach "a first satellite antenna for generating a wide beam communication signal to illuminate a plurality of satellites."

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

Second, as the Examiner admits, Mallinckrodt does not teach "a satellite antenna repositioning system for repositioning said second antenna when the sun transits within the beamwidth of said second antenna," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites Bond to cure this deficiency. However, Bond does not teach a system for repositioning a second antenna, because Bond does not teach a second antenna, but rather the repositioning of a single ground station antenna. (See col. 9, lines 35-40.) The repositioning of a single antenna has a number of disadvantages, as discussed in Applicant's specification (see page 3). Therefore, neither Mallinckrodt nor Bond, nor any reasonable combination of the two, teaches every element of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 2, this claim is patentable, at least, by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

With respect to claim 3, this claim recites, among other things, "a third satellite antenna, directed to a second one of the plurality of satellites located proximate to said first satellite, for receiving said return communication signal from said second satellite only during sun transit outages of said second antenna." The Examiner fails to point to any reference of there being a third satellite antenna, directed to a second one of the plurality of satellites located proximate to said first satellite, in either Mallinckrodt or Bond. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 4, this claim is patentable, at least, by virtue of its dependence from claim 3.

With respect to claim 5, this claim is patentable, at least, for reasons similar to those discussed with reference to claim 1. Claim 5 recites, among other things,

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

"repositioning said second satellite antenna to receive the return signal from only a second of the plurality of satellites during periods when the sun transits behind said first satellite." Bond, cited by the Examiner for teaching the repositioning of a second antenna. However, as described above, Bond does not teach a second antenna, and therefore cannot teach the repositioning of a second satellite antenna. Claim 5 is thus patentable over Mallinckrodt in view of Bond.

With respect to claim 6, this claim recites, among other things, "aligning a third antenna to receive the return signal from a second one of the plurality of satellites." As described with reference to claim 3, the Examiner fails to point out any teaching of a third antenna in either Mallinckrodt or Bond. Furthermore, this claim also recites, among other things, "receiving the return signal from said first satellite at said second antenna when the sun is outside the beamwidth of said second antenna" and "receiving the return signal from said second satellite with said third antenna when the sun is within the beamwidth of said first satellite." Neither Mallinckrodt nor Bond teach this combination of elements. Therefore, claim 6 is patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 7, the Examiner fails to address the elements of this claim in the Office Action. Therefore, this claim is patentable over Mallinckrodt in view of Bond.

With respect to claim 8, this claim recites, among other things, "a receiver for receiving communication signals at one of said first and second antennas, said receiver including an antenna switch selector for selectively activating said first and said second antennas, the selector activating the second antenna during periods when the sun transits within a beamwidth of said first antenna." The Examiner asserts that Bond

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

teaches this limitation at col. 11, lines 7-14. However, Bond is directed to two stations, one acting as a transmission station and one acting as a receiving station. (See col. 11, lines 7-10.) The switching means is used to select signals from between a plurality of satellites (col. 11, lines 12-14.). However, the claimed invention recites two antennas, where the switch selector is used to switch between the two antennas. Therefore, no reasonable combination of Mallinckrodt and Bond teaches every element of claim 8. Accordingly, this claim is patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 6, 2001

By: Kristen Jacobsen Oenge
Jeffrey A. Berkowitz Reg No
for Reg. No. 36,743 45,811

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000